arXiv:1209.0438v2 [math.DG] 24 Sep 2012

AN ALEXANDROV-FENCHEL-TYPE INEQUALITY IN HYPERBOLIC SPACE WITH AN APPLICATION TO A PENROSE INEQUALITY

LEVI LOPES DE LIMA AND FREDERICO GIRÃO

ABSTRACT. We use the inverse mean curvature flow to prove a sharp Alexandrov-Fenchel-type inequality for star-shaped, strictly mean convex hypersurfaces in hyperbolic n-space, $n \geq 3$. As an application we establish, in any dimension, an optimal Penrose inequality for asymptotically hyperbolic graphs carrying a minimal horizon, with the equality occurring if and only if the graph is an anti-de Sitter-Schwarzschild solution. This sharpens previous results by Dahl-Gicquaud-Sakovich and settles, for this class of initial data sets, the conjectured Penrose inequality for time-symmetric space-times with negative cosmological constant.

1. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENTS OF THE RESULTS

If $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a convex hypersurface then the Alexandrov-Fenchel inequalities say that

$$\int_\Sigma \sigma_k(\kappa) d\Sigma \geq C_{n,k} \left(\int_\Sigma \sigma_{k-1}(\kappa) d\Sigma \right)^{\frac{n-k-1}{n-k}}, \tag{1.1}$$

where $\sigma_k(\kappa)$, $1 \leq k \leq n-1$, is the k^{th} elementary symmetric function of the principal curvature vector $\kappa = (\kappa_1, \cdots, \kappa_{n-1})$ of Σ and $C_{n,k} > 0$ is a universal constant. Moreover, the equality holds in (1.1) if and only if Σ is a round sphere. Classically, (1.1) follows from the general theory of mixed volumes, so that convexity is used in an essential way; see [S]. Recently, however, Guan and Li [GL] used a suitable normalization of a certain inverse curvature flow to extend the validity of (1.1), with the corresponding rigidity statement, for any Σ which is star-shaped and k-convex (which means that $\sigma_i(\kappa) \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \cdots, k$).

An interesting question is to establish versions of these inequalities for appropriate classes of hypersurfaces in more general ambient manifolds, preferably with a corresponding rigidity statement for the case of equality. Here we focus on the case $k = 1$ of (1.1), namely,

$$c_n \int_\Sigma H d\Sigma \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{A}{\omega_{n-1}} \right)^{\frac{n-2}{n-1}}, \tag{1.2}$$

where A is the area, $H = \sigma_1(\kappa)$ is the mean curvature,

$$c_n = \frac{1}{2(n-1)\omega_{n-1}},$$

and ω_{n-1} is the area of the unit sphere $\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. We take a first step toward solving this problem by establishing a natural analogue of (1.2) for star-shaped, strictly mean convex hypersurfaces in hyperbolic n-space, $n \geq 3$; see Theorem 1.1.

The first author was partially supported by CNPq/Brazil and FUNCAP/CE.

The proof is partly inspired by [GL] and uses the inverse mean curvature flow recently studied by Gerhardt [G2] and Ding [D]. Also, a Heintze-Karcher-type inequality due to Brendle [B] plays a crucial role in our argument. We note that Gallego and Solanes [GS] proved related isoperimetric inequalities using integral-geometric methods, but their results do not seem to be sharp.

The inequality (1.2) has recently become relevant in the context of the Penrose inequality for asymptotically flat graphs carrying a minimal horizon [L] [dLG1] and for asymptotically hyperbolic graphs carrying a constant mean curvature horizon [dLG2]. As an application of Theorem 1.1 we establish an optimal Penrose inequality for asymptotically hyperbolic graphs carrying a minimal horizon, including the rigidity statement according to which the equality holds only if (M, g) is the graph realization of the anti-de Sitter-Schwarzschild solution; see Theorem 1.2. This Penrose inequality improves recent results by Dahl-Gicquaud-Sakovich [DGS] and settles, for this class of initial data sets, the conjectured Penrose inequality for time-symmetric space-times with negative cosmological constant [BC] [Ma]. We remark that the proof of the rigidity is based on a recent preprint by Huang and Wu [HW1]; see also [dLG3].

To explain our results, let us consider the hyperbolic n-space $\mathbb{H}^n$ with coordinates $(r,\theta) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and endowed with the metric

$$g_0 = dr^2 + \sinh^2 r\, h, \tag{1.3}$$

where r is the geodesic distance to a chosen origin corresponding to $r = 0$ and h is the round metric on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. We say that a closed, embedded hypersurface $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{H}^n$ is *star-shaped* if it can be written as a radial graph over a geodesic sphere centered at the origin. Also, it is *strictly mean convex* if its mean curvature H is positive everywhere. We also consider $\rho : \mathbb{H}^n \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$\rho(r) = \cosh r. \tag{1.4}$$

With this notation at hand we can state the hyperbolic Alexandrov-Fenchel-type inequality.

Theorem 1.1. *If $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{H}^n$ is a star-shaped and strictly mean convex hypersurface then*

$$c_n \int_\Sigma \rho H d\Sigma \geq \frac{1}{2}\left(\left(\frac{A}{\omega_{n-1}}\right)^{\frac{n-2}{n-1}} + \left(\frac{A}{\omega_{n-1}}\right)^{\frac{n}{n-1}}\right), \tag{1.5}$$

where A is the area of Σ. Moreover, the equality holds if and only if Σ is a geodesic sphere centered at the origin.

We now explain the relevance of this result for a certain Penrose inequality. Recall that a Riemannian manifold (M^n, g) is said to be *asymptotically hyperbolic* if there exists a compact subset $K \subset M$ and a diffeomorphism $\Psi : M - K \to \mathbb{H}^n - K_0$, where $K_0 \subset \mathbb{H}^n$ is compact, such that

$$\|\Psi_* g - g_0\|_{g_0} = O(e^{-\tau r}), \quad \|D\Psi_* g\|_{g_0} = O(e^{-\tau r}), \tag{1.6}$$

as $r \to +\infty$, for some $\tau > n/2$. Here, D is the covariant derivative of g_0. We also assume that the difference between scalar curvatures, namely,

$$\mathfrak{R}_g = R_g + n(n-1),$$

is integrable. For this class of manifolds it is possible to define a mass-like invariant as follows; see [CH], [CN], [He] and [M] for more details. We consider the space $\mathcal{N}$ of functions $f:\mathbb{H}^n\to\mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$D^2 f = f g_0. \tag{1.7}$$

It turns out that $\mathcal{N}$ is generated by $\{\rho_0,\rho_1,\cdots,\rho_n\}$, where $\rho_0=\rho$ and $\rho_i=(\sinh r)\theta_i$, with $\theta=(\theta_1,\cdots,\theta_{n-1}):\mathbb{S}^{n-1}\to\mathbb{R}^n$ being the standard embedding. If Ψ is a chart at infinity as above, we define the corresponding mass functional $\mathfrak{m}_\Psi:\mathcal{N}\to\mathbb{R}$ by

$$\mathfrak{m}_\Psi(\varphi)=\lim_{r\to+\infty} c_n\int_{\mathcal{S}_r}\left(\varphi\left(\operatorname{div}_{g_0}e-d\operatorname{tr}_{g_0}e\right)-i_{D\varphi}e+(\operatorname{tr}_{g_0}e)d\varphi\right)(\nu_r)d\mathcal{S}_r, \tag{1.8}$$

where $e=\Psi_*g-g_0$ and ν_r is the unit normal to a large coordinate sphere $\mathcal{S}_r$ of radius r. If Φ is another chart at infinity one verifies that

$$\mathfrak{m}_\Phi(\varphi)=\mathfrak{m}_\Psi(\varphi\circ\mathcal{I}^{-1}), \tag{1.9}$$

where $\mathcal{I}\in\operatorname{Isom}(\mathbb{H}^n)$ satisfies

$$\|\Phi\circ\Psi^{-1}-\mathcal{I}\|_{g_0}=O(e^{-\tau r}),\quad r\to+\infty.$$

Since the action of $\operatorname{Isom}(\mathbb{H}^n)$ on $\mathcal{N}$ appearing on the right-hand side of (1.9) preserves the Lorentzian metric

$$(z,w)=z_0w_0-z_1w_1\cdots-z_nw_n,$$

with $\{\rho_\alpha\}_{\alpha=0}^n$ being an orthonormal basis and ρ being time-like and future oriented, it follows that the real number $\mathfrak{m}_{(M,g)}$ defined up to sign by

$$\mathfrak{m}^2_{(M,g)}=|(\mathfrak{m}_\Psi,\mathfrak{m}_\Psi)| \tag{1.10}$$

does *not* depend on the chart Ψ and is termed the *mass* of (M,g). We note that the causal character of $\mathfrak{m}_\Psi$ is also invariant under coordinate changes at infinity, so it is natural to choose $\mathfrak{m}_{(M,g)}>0$ if $\mathfrak{m}_\Psi$ is time-like and future directed.

The Positive Mass Conjecture in this context asserts that if $\mathfrak{R}_g\geq 0$ then $\mathfrak{m}_\Psi$ is time-like and future-directed or vanishes, the latter occurring only if (M,g) is isometric to $(\mathbb{H}^n,g_0)$. Equivalently, $\mathfrak{m}_{(M,g)}\geq 0$ with equality holding only for hyperbolic space. This has been proved for the spin case by Chruściel and Herzlich [CH], generalizing a previous contribution by Wang [W]; see also [ACG] for a similar result in low dimensions with the spin condition removed. Moreover, if M carries a (possibly disconneted) compact, outermost minimal boundary Γ (a *horizon*), then the corresponding Penrose Conjecture says that

$$\mathfrak{m}_{(M,g)}\geq\frac{1}{2}\left(\left(\frac{A}{\omega_{n-1}}\right)^{\frac{n-2}{n-1}}+\left(\frac{A}{\omega_{n-1}}\right)^{\frac{n}{n-1}}\right), \tag{1.11}$$

with the equality holding only if (M,g) is the exterior anti-de Sitter-Schwarzschild solution. We refer to the surveys [BC] and [Ma] for background on this conjecture.

Progress in establishing (1.11) has been restricted so far to the case of graphs, as we now pass to explain. Recall that the metric

$$\overline{g}=\rho^2dt^2+g_0,\quad t\in\mathbb{R}, \tag{1.12}$$

realizes $\mathbb{H}^n\times\mathbb{R}$ as the hyperbolic $(n+1)$-space $\mathbb{H}^{n+1}$. Using this model we then say that a complete immersed hypersurface $M\subset\mathbb{H}^{n+1}$ is *asymptotically hyperbolic* if there exists a compact subset $K\subset M$ such that $M-K$ can be written as a vertical graph associated to a smooth function $u:\mathbb{H}^n-K_0\to\mathbb{R}$, where $K_0\subset\mathbb{H}^n$ is compact, so that (1.6) holds for the chart Ψ given by $\Psi(x,u(x))=x$, $x\in M-K_0$.

As explained in [dLG2], if additionally M carries a minimal horizon Γ then we may assume that $\mathfrak{m}_\Psi$ is time-like and future oriented so that after composing Ψ with an isometry we have

$$\mathfrak{m}_{(M,g)} = \mathfrak{m}_\Psi(\rho). \tag{1.13}$$

Charts with this property are called *balanced*. Now let M be *balanced* in the sense that nonparametric coordinates at infinity are balanced as above. Moreover, assume that Γ lies on a totally geodesic hypersurface $P \subset \mathbb{H}^{n+1}$ defined by $t = t_0$, $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, and that M meets P orthogonally along Γ, so that Γ is minimal (hence, a horizon indeed). Under these conditions and starting from (1.13) it is shown in [dLG2] that

$$\mathfrak{m}_{(M,g)} = c_n \int_M \Theta \mathfrak{R}_g dM + c_n \int_\Gamma \rho H d\Gamma, \tag{1.14}$$

where $\Theta = \langle N, \partial/\partial t \rangle$, with N being the unit normal to M pointing upward at infinity and H being the mean curvature of $\Gamma \subset P$ with respect to its inward pointing unit normal.

We remark that if M is a graph then (1.14) has been previously proved in [DGS]. If this is the case, so that $\Theta > 0$, and if we assume further that $\mathfrak{R}_g \geq 0$ then we obtain from (1.14) that

$$\mathfrak{m}_{(M,g)} \geq c_n \int_\Gamma \rho H d\Gamma. \tag{1.15}$$

In [DGS] this estimate is used to obtain several sub-optimal versions of (1.11). For instance, assuming that $\Gamma \subset P = \mathbb{H}^n$ is h-convex (in the sense that all principal curvatures are at least 1) and encloses the origin of P, the authors show that

$$\mathfrak{m}_{(M,g)} \geq \frac{1}{2}\left(\left(\frac{A}{\omega_{n-1}} \right)^{\frac{n-2}{n-1}} + \sinh r_{in} \frac{A}{\omega_{n-1}} \right),$$

where r_{in} is the radius of the largest geodesic ball centered at the origin and contained in the region enclosed by Γ. Notice that this only yields the conjectured inequality (1.11) if Γ is a geodesic sphere centered at the origin. In view of Theorem 1.1, however, we immediately obtain the first statement in the following result. Recall that a hypersurface is said to be *mean convex* if its mean curvature is non-negative everywhere.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $(M, g) \subset \mathbb{H}^{n+1}$ be a balanced asymptotically hyperbolic graph carrying a minimal horizon Γ as above. If we assume further that $\Gamma \subset P = \mathbb{H}^n$ is star-shaped (with respect to the origin) and mean convex then (1.11) holds if $R_g \geq -n(n-1)$. Moreover, the equality occurs if and only if (M, g) is the graph realization of the (exterior) anti-de Sitter-Schwarzchild solution (see (4.54) below).*

As remarked above, the rigidity statement requires a separate argument and is based on results in a recent preprint by Huang and Wu [HW1].

Remark 1.1. After a first version of this manuscript was posted on the arXiv, there appeared a preprint by Brendle, Hung and Wang [BHW], where a sharp geometric inequality for strictly mean convex, star-shaped hypersurfaces in the anti-de Sitter-Schwarzschild space is established by using similar methods. In particular, by sending the mass parameter to zero, they obtain an inequality in hyperbolic space, which happens to follow from (1.5); see Remark 3.2.

Acknowledgements. The work leading to this paper started when the authors were visiting IMPA on the occasion of its 2012 Summer Program and they would like to thank Prof. F. Marques for providing a wonderful scientific environment. Also, the authors thank Prof. A. Neves for comments on a previous version of the manuscript and specially for pointing out the need to refine the asymptotic analysis of certain monotone quantities used in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

2. GEOMETRIC FLOWS FOR HYPERSURFACES

As mentioned above, the proof of Theorem 1.1 uses the inverse mean curvature flow recently studied by Gerhardt [G2] and Ding [D]. As a preparation for the argument, let us start by considering a closed, isometrically immersed hypersurface $\Sigma\subset\mathbb{H}^n$ with unit normal ξ. We denote by g and b the metric and second fundamental form of Σ, respectively. Thus, if X and Y are vector fields tangent to Σ,

$$b(X,Y)=g(aX,Y),$$

where

$$aX=-D_X\xi,$$

is the shape operator. As before, we denote by $\kappa=(\kappa_1,\cdots,\kappa_{n-1})$ the principal curvature vector of Σ, so that

$$H=\sigma_1(\kappa)=\mathrm{tr}_g b \tag{2.16}$$

is the *mean curvature*. It follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality that

$$(n-1)|a|^2\geq H^2, \tag{2.17}$$

with the equality occurring at a given point if and only if Σ is umbilical there. We also consider the *extrinsic scalar curvature* of the immersion, namely,

$$K=\sigma_2(\kappa)=\sum_{i<j}\kappa_i\kappa_j=\frac{1}{2}\left(H^2-|a|^2\right). \tag{2.18}$$

Notice that these invariants are related by the Newton-MacLaurin inequality:

$$2K\leq\frac{n-2}{n-1}H^2, \tag{2.19}$$

with the equality holding at a given point only if Σ is umbilical there [HLP]. We also recall the *support function*

$$p=\langle D\rho,\xi\rangle, \tag{2.20}$$

which relates to ρ and H by means of the following Minkowski identity:

$$\Delta\rho=(n-1)\rho+Hp, \tag{2.21}$$

where $\Delta=\mathrm{div}\circ\nabla$ is the Laplacian of g. This is a consequence of the fact that the vector field $D\rho$ is *conformal*, that is,

$$D_XD\rho=\rho X, \tag{2.22}$$

for any vector field X in $\mathbb{H}^n$. Another useful consequence of (2.22) is the formula

$$\mathrm{div}\,(G\nabla\rho)=(n-2)\rho H+2pK, \tag{2.23}$$

where

$$G=HI-a \tag{2.24}$$

is the *Newton tensor* of a; see [AdLM] for further details.

We now consider an one-parameter family $X(t,\cdot):\Sigma^{n-1}\to\mathbb{H}^n$, $t\in[0,\epsilon)$, of closed, isometrically immersed hypersurfaces evolving according to

$$\frac{\partial X}{\partial t}=F\xi, \tag{2.25}$$

where ξ is the unit normal to $\Sigma_t=X(t,\cdot)$ and F is a general speed function. To save notation we also denote the evolving hypersurface simply by Σ whenever no confusion arises. The following evolution equations are well-known [Z].

Proposition 2.1. *Under the flow (2.25) we have:*

(1) *The unit normal evolves as*

$$\frac{\partial \xi}{\partial t}=-\nabla F; \tag{2.26}$$

(2) *The area element $d\Sigma$ evolves as*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}d\Sigma=-FHd\Sigma. \tag{2.27}$$

In particular, if A is the area of Σ then

$$\frac{dA}{dt}=-\int_\Sigma FHd\Sigma; \tag{2.28}$$

(3) *The mean curvature evolves as*

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial t}=\Delta F+(|a|^2-(n-1))F. \tag{2.29}$$

If Σ is star-shaped and mean convex then our conventions imply that ξ is the *inward* pointing unit normal vector. Thus, in the model (1.3), Σ can be graphically represented by means of a map of the type

$$\theta\in\mathbb{S}^{n-1}\mapsto(u(\theta),\theta)\in\mathbb{H}^n, \tag{2.30}$$

for some smooth function u. In particular, if $\theta=(\theta_1,\cdots,\theta_{n-1})$ is a local coordinate system on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and $E_i=\partial/\partial\theta_i$ then the tangent space to the graph is spanned by

$$Z_i=u_i\frac{\partial}{\partial r}+E_i,\quad u_i=E_i(u),\quad i=1,\cdots,n-1, \tag{2.31}$$

so we can take

$$\xi=\frac{1}{W}\left(\nabla_h u-\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\right),\quad W=\sqrt{1+|\nabla_h u|^2}. \tag{2.32}$$

Also,

$$p=-\frac{\sinh r}{W}. \tag{2.33}$$

Notice that $p\leq 0$.

From now on we assume that $\Sigma=\Sigma_t=X(t,\cdot)$ is a one-parameter family of star-shaped, strictly mean convex hypersurfaces evolving according to (2.25). This assumption will be justified later on for the flows we shall consider; see Proposition 2.6 and Remark 2.1.

Proposition 2.2. *Under the above conditions, the function ρ evolves along the flow (2.25) according to*

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = pF. \tag{2.34}$$

Proof. As noted above, we can graphically represent Σ by (2.30), where u is time dependent, so that (2.25) implies

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = -\frac{F}{W}.$$

Since $u = r$ along Σ we have

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = \sinh r \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = -\frac{\sinh r\, F}{W},$$

and the result follows from (2.33). □

The following proposition computes the variation of the curvature integral

$$\mathcal{I}(\Sigma) = \int_\Sigma \rho H d\Sigma \tag{2.35}$$

on the left-hand side of (1.5).

Proposition 2.3. *Along the flow (2.25) we have*

$$\frac{d\mathcal{I}}{dt} = 2\int_\Sigma pHFd\Sigma - 2\int_\Sigma \rho KFd\Sigma. \tag{2.36}$$

Proof. Using Propositions 2.1 and 2.2,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\mathcal{I}}{dt} &= \int_\Sigma \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} H d\Sigma + \int_\Sigma \rho \frac{\partial H}{\partial t} d\Sigma + \int_\Sigma \rho H \frac{\partial}{\partial t} d\Sigma \\
&= \int_\Sigma pHFd\Sigma + \int_\Sigma \rho \left(\Delta F + \left(|a|^2 - (n-1)\right) F\right) d\Sigma - \\
&\qquad - \int_\Sigma \rho H^2 F d\Sigma \\
&= \int_M pHFd\Sigma + \int_\Sigma F\Delta\rho d\Sigma + \int_\Sigma \rho \left(|a|^2 - (n-1)\right) F d\Sigma - \\
&\qquad - \int_\Sigma \rho H^2 f d\Sigma,
\end{aligned}$$

and the result follows, after some cancelations, from (2.18) and (2.21). □

Proposition 2.4. *Along the flow (2.25), the support function evolves according to*

$$\frac{\partial p}{\partial t} = F\rho - \langle \nabla \rho, \nabla F \rangle. \tag{2.37}$$

As a consequence,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Sigma p d\Sigma = n\int_\Sigma F\rho d\Sigma. \tag{2.38}$$

Proof. Using (2.20), (2.22) and (2.26) we compute:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial p}{\partial t} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\langle D\rho, \xi, \rangle \\ &= F\langle D_\xi D\rho, \xi\rangle + \langle D\rho, D_{\partial/\partial t}\xi\rangle \\ &= F\rho - \langle \nabla\rho, \nabla F\rangle,\end{aligned}$$

which proves (2.37). Now, using this and (2.27),

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Sigma p d\Sigma &= \int_\Sigma \frac{\partial p}{\partial t} d\Sigma + \int_\Sigma p\frac{\partial}{\partial t} d\Sigma \\ &= \int_\Sigma F\rho d\Sigma - \int_\Sigma \langle\nabla\rho, \nabla F\rangle d\Sigma - \int_\Sigma pFH d\Sigma \\ &= \int_\Sigma F\rho d\Sigma + \int_\Sigma F\Delta\rho d\Sigma - \int_\Sigma pFH d\Sigma,\end{aligned}$$

so that (2.38) follows from (2.21). □

The following proposition, proved in [B], plays a crucial role in our argument.

Proposition 2.5. *If $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{H}^n$ is star-shaped and strictly mean convex then*

$$(n-1)\int_\Sigma \frac{\rho}{H} d\Sigma \geq -\int_\Sigma p d\Sigma. \tag{2.39}$$

Moreover, the equality holds if and only if Σ is totally umbilical.

Proof. This is a rather special case of the Heintze-Karcher-type inequality proved in [B], so we merely sketch the elegant argument there. The idea is to let Σ flow under

$$\frac{\partial X}{\partial t} = \rho\xi, \tag{2.40}$$

so we take $F = \rho$ in (2.25). Using (2.29), (2.34), (2.21) and (2.17) we see that, as long as the flow exists,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\frac{\rho}{H} &= \frac{1}{H}\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial t} - \frac{\rho}{H^2}\frac{\partial H}{\partial t} \\ &= \frac{p\rho}{H} - \frac{\rho}{H^2}\left(\Delta\rho + \left(|a|^2 - (n-1)\right)\rho\right) \\ &= -\frac{\rho^2}{H^2}|a|^2 \\ &\leq -\frac{\rho^2}{n-1},\end{aligned}$$

so that by (2.27),

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Sigma \frac{\rho}{H} d\Sigma \leq -\frac{n}{n-1}\int_\Sigma \rho^2 d\Sigma.$$

Combining this with (2.38) we finally get

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left((n-1)\int_\Sigma \frac{\rho}{H} d\Sigma + \int_\Sigma p d\Sigma\right) \leq 0,$$

that is, the quantity in the parenthesis is monotone non-increasing along the flow (2.40). The next step is to investigate the asymptotic behavior of solutions of (2.40). This might appear problematic at first sight but the crucial observation is that

(2.40) is equivalent to the standard flow by *inward* parallel hypersurfaces ($F = 1$) in the conformal metric

$$\tilde{g}_0 = \rho^{-2} g_0 = \frac{dr^2}{\cosh^2 r} + \tanh^2 r h.$$

Thus, any solution becomes extinct in a certain finite time $t_* > 0$ so that

$$\lim_{t \to t_*} (n-1) \int_\Sigma \frac{\rho}{H} d\Sigma + \int_\Sigma p d\Sigma = 0,$$

as desired. In fact, an additional complication arises from the fact that the flow might develop singularities before the extinction time due to the appearance of cut points but, as explained in [B], a regularization procedure can be implemented to take care of this. □

Remark 2.1. It follows from the computation above that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \frac{H}{\rho} \geq \frac{H^2}{n-1},$$

which implies that strict mean convexity is preserved under (2.40).

From now on we specialize to the flow

$$\frac{\partial X}{\partial t} = -\frac{\xi}{H}, \tag{2.41}$$

so that $F = -1/H$. This is the famous *inverse mean curvature flow*, which has been extensively studied in a variety of contexts [G1] [U] [HI] [N]. Here we will make use of recent results by Gerhardt [G2] for evolving hypersurfaces in hyperbolic space, which we collect below; see also [D].

Proposition 2.6. *If the initial hypersurface is star-shaped and strictly mean convex then the corresponding solution is defined for all $t > 0$ and expands the evolving hypersurfaces toward infinity while maintaining star-shapedness and strictly mean convexity. Moreover, the hypersurfaces become strictly convex exponentially fast and also more and more umbilical in the sense that*

$$|b_i^j - \delta_i^j| \leq C e^{-\frac{t}{n-1}}, \quad t > 0, \tag{2.42}$$

that is, the principal curvatures are uniformly bounded and converge exponentially fast to 1. *In fact, the final shape of the hypersurface is spherical in the sense that a suitable normalization of the solution (by using the Poincaré disk model, say) evolves the hypersurface to a geodesic sphere.*

Remark 2.2. Even though Gerhardt's roundness estimate (2.42) goes a long way toward describing the asymptotic behavior of solutions, for the application we have in mind a slight refinement is required, specially regarding the analysis of certain monotone quantities along the flow; see Appendix A.

3. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

The proof of Theorem 1.1 involves the consideration of a series of monotone quantities along the solution of (2.41) with Σ as the initial hypersurface. Thus, for any closed $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{H}^n$ we set

$$\mathcal{J}(\Sigma) = -\int_\Sigma p d\Sigma, \tag{3.43}$$

$$\mathcal{K}(\Sigma)=\omega_{n-1}\mathcal{A}(\Sigma)^{\frac{n}{n-1}}, \tag{3.44}$$

where $\mathcal{A}(\Sigma)=A/\omega_{n-1}$, and

$$\mathcal{L}(\Sigma)=\frac{\mathcal{I}(\Sigma)-(n-1)\mathcal{K}(\Sigma)}{\mathcal{A}(\Sigma)^{\frac{n-2}{n-1}}}. \tag{3.45}$$

To save notation, sometimes we write $\mathcal{I}(t)=\mathcal{I}(\Sigma_t)$, etc.

Proposition 3.1. *On a geodesic sphere centered at the origin,*

$$\mathcal{J}=\mathcal{K} \tag{3.46}$$

and

$$\mathcal{L}=(n-1)\omega_{n-1}. \tag{3.47}$$

Proof. If the geodesic sphere has radius r then its area is $A=\omega_{n-1}\sinh^{n-1}r$ and its mean curvature is $H=(n-1)\coth r$. Also, by (2.33), its support function is $p=-\sinh r$. The results then follow by direct computations. □

Remark 3.1. Clearly, (3.47) above just means that for a geodesic sphere centered at the origin the equality in (1.5) is attained. On the other hand, we claim that the strict inequality holds in (1.5) if Σ is a geodesic sphere *not* centered at the origin. In effect, if $\Sigma\subset\mathbb{H}^n$ is *any* geodesic sphere of radius r then

$$K=\frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{2}\coth^2 r,$$

so that (2.23) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Sigma \rho H d\Sigma &= -\frac{2}{n-2}\int_\Sigma pK d\Sigma\\ &= -(n-1)\coth^2 r\int_\Sigma p d\Sigma.\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, if B is the geodesic ball bounded by Σ, (2.20), (2.22) and the divergence theorem imply

$$\int_\Sigma p d\Sigma=-\int_B \Delta_{\mathbb{H}^n}\rho d\mathbb{H}^n=-n\int_B \rho d\mathbb{H}^n,$$

so that

$$\int_\Sigma \rho H d\Sigma=n(n-1)\coth^2 r\int_B \rho d\mathbb{H}^n.$$

The claim follows easily from this.

Proposition 3.2. *If the initial hypersurface Σ in (2.41) is star-shaped and strictly mean convex then*

$$\frac{d\mathcal{A}}{dt}=\mathcal{A} \tag{3.48}$$

and

$$\frac{d\mathcal{K}}{dt}=\frac{n}{n-1}\mathcal{K}. \tag{3.49}$$

Also,

$$\frac{d\mathcal{J}}{dt}\geq\frac{n}{n-1}\mathcal{J}, \tag{3.50}$$

with the equality occurring if and only if Σ is totally umbilical.

Proof. Clearly, (3.49) follows from (3.48), which is a consequence of (2.28) with $F = -1/H$. Also, (3.50) follows immediately from (2.38) and (2.39). □

The above results can be used to prove an useful integral geometric inequality that might have an independent interest.

Proposition 3.3. *If Σ is star-shaped and strictly mean convex then*

$$\mathcal{J}(\Sigma) \leq \mathcal{K}(\Sigma). \tag{3.51}$$

Moreover, the equality holds if and only if Σ is totally umbilical.

Proof. As usual, we let Σ flow under (2.41). By (3.49) and (3.50) we get

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left(\mathcal{J}-\mathcal{K}\right) \geq \frac{n}{n-1}\left(\mathcal{J}-\mathcal{K}\right),$$

which by (3.48) yields

$$\frac{d}{dt}\frac{\mathcal{J}-\mathcal{K}}{\mathcal{A}^{\frac{n}{n-1}}} \geq 0.$$

Thus, for any $t > 0$,

$$\frac{\mathcal{J}-\mathcal{K}}{\mathcal{A}^{\frac{n}{n-1}}}(0) \leq \frac{\mathcal{J}-\mathcal{K}}{\mathcal{A}^{\frac{n}{n-1}}}(t).$$

But by Proposition A.1,

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty}\frac{\mathcal{J}-\mathcal{K}}{\mathcal{A}^{\frac{n}{n-1}}}(t) = 0,$$

which proves (3.51). Also, if the equality holds then it holds in (3.50) as well. □

We now have at our disposal all the ingredients needed to prove Theorem 1.1. We start by noticing that, by (2.36) with $F = -1/H$,

$$\frac{d\mathcal{I}}{dt} = 2\int_\Sigma \frac{\rho K}{H}d\Sigma + 2\mathcal{J},$$

so that by (2.19),

$$\frac{d\mathcal{I}}{dt} \leq \frac{n-2}{n-1}\mathcal{I} + 2\mathcal{J}.$$

From (3.49), after a rearrangement of terms, we get

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left(\mathcal{I}-(n-1)\mathcal{K}\right) \leq \frac{n-2}{n-1}\left(\mathcal{I}-(n-1)\mathcal{K}\right) + 2\left(\mathcal{J}-\mathcal{K}\right),$$

which by (3.51) yields

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left(\mathcal{I}-(n-1)\mathcal{K}\right) \leq \frac{n-2}{n-1}\left(\mathcal{I}-(n-1)\mathcal{K}\right).$$

In the presence of (3.48), this gives

$$\frac{d\mathcal{L}}{dt} \leq 0,$$

so that

$$\mathcal{L}(0) \geq \mathcal{L}(t), \quad t > 0.$$

But by Proposition A.1 we have

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty}\mathcal{L}(t) \geq (n-1)\omega_{n-1},$$

and this gives

$$\mathcal{L}(0) \geq (n-1)\omega_{n-1},$$

which is just a rewriting of (1.5). Moreover, if the equality holds then it also holds in (3.51), which implies that Σ is a geodesic sphere necessarily centered at the origin by Remark 3.1. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Remark 3.2. In our notation, it is proved in [BHW] that

$$\int_\Sigma (\rho H + (n-1)p)\, d\Sigma \geq (n-1)\omega_{n-1}^{\frac{1}{n-1}} A^{\frac{n-2}{n-1}}, \tag{3.52}$$

with the equality holding if and only if Σ is a geodesic sphere centered at the origin. This follows from a sharp inequality for strictly mean convex, star-shaped hypersurface in the anti-de Sitter-Schwarzschild space, after sending the mass parameter to zero. We observe that (3.52) follows from Theorem 1.1, if we take Proposition 3.3 into account.

4. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

We now turn to the proof of the rigidity statement in Theorem 1.2. We recall that the *anti-de Sitter Schwarzschild solution* of mass $m > 0$ is given by

$$g_{\mathrm{adSS}} = \frac{dr^2}{1 + r^2 - \frac{2m}{r^{n-2}}} + r^2 h, \quad r \geq r_m, \tag{4.53}$$

where h is the round metric on S^{n-1} and r_m is the only positive solution of

$$1 + r^2 = \frac{2m}{r^{n-2}}.$$

The metric g_{adSS} is asymptotically hyperbolic and a direct computation shows that $R_{g_{\mathrm{adSS}}} \equiv -n(n-1)$. Moreover, the horizon $r = r_m$ is minimal and it is easy to see that the equality in (1.5) holds for this example. The rigidity statement then says that, conversely, if the equality holds in Theorem 1.2 then the graph M is *congruent* to the graphical realization of (4.53) inside $\mathbb{H}^{n+1}$ for some $m > 0$, which in the model (1.12) is defined by a function $u_m = u_m(r)$ satisfying $u_m(r_m) = 0$ and

$$(1 + r^2)\left(\frac{du_m}{dr}\right)^2 = \frac{1}{1 + r^2 - \frac{2m}{r^{n-2}}} - \frac{1}{1 + r^2}; \tag{4.54}$$

see [DGS] for details.

As already mentioned, rigidity follows from a rather straightforward adaptation of an argument due to Huang and Wu [HW1], so we merely indicate how to put the main ideas together. First, the Alexandrov-Fenchel type inequality (1.5) holds for mean convex hypersurfaces as well, since any such hypersurface can be arbitrarily approximated, in the C^2 topology, by strictly mean convex ones. Thus, if the equality holds in Theorem 1.2 then (1.14) with $\Theta > 0$ implies that the graph (M, g) satisfies $R_g = -n(n-1)$ everywhere. Equivalently, by Gauss equation,

$$K^M = 0, \tag{4.55}$$

where

$$K^M = \sigma_2(\kappa^M) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \kappa_i^M \kappa_j^M$$

is the (extrinsic) scalar curvature of M. Here,

$$\kappa^M = (\kappa_1^M, \cdots, \kappa_n^M)$$

is the principal curvature vector of M.

If a^M is the shape operator of M then, as usual, its Newton tensor is given by

$$G^M = H^M I - a^M,$$

where $H^M = \sigma_1(\kappa^M)$ is the mean curvature; compare with (2.24). A classical computation [R] [HL] shows that (4.55) is elliptic at the given solution precisely when G^M is positive (or negative) definite. Notice that the eigenvalues of G^M are

$$\lambda_i = \frac{\partial K^M}{\partial \kappa_i^M} = \sum_{j\neq i} \kappa_j^M, \quad i = 1, \cdots, n,$$

and from this it is easy to check that the adSS solution (4.54) is elliptic everywhere.

The first main observation in [HW1] is the following elementary algebraic inequality: for any i there holds

$$H^M \lambda_i \geq K^M + \frac{n}{2(n-1)}\lambda_i^2. \tag{4.56}$$

This immediately yields the following result.

Proposition 4.1. *If a solution of (4.55) satisfies $H^M \geq 0$ then G^M is semi-positive definite, that is, $\lambda_i \geq 0$ for any i.*

This means that the problem of comparing general graph solutions of (4.55) with the model hypersurface (4.54) via a suitable version of the Maximum Principle essentially boils down to checking that any such solution satisfies $H^M \geq 0$. This is achieved in [HW1] for asymptotically flat graphs with a minimal horizon in Euclidean space by first observing that, by Gauss equation, the points where $H^M = 0$ are precisely those where the shape operator vanishes. These are the so-called *geodesic points* and a well-known structure result by Sacksteder [Sa] provides a precise description of the subset M_* of *interior* geodesic points. More precisely, Sacksteder's theorem says that a given connected component of M_*, say M_*', always lies on a totally geodesic hyperplane which is tangent to the graph along M_*'. The same result holds *verbatim* in our case since the proof only involves the consideration of a Gauss map which is clearly available if we use the hyperboloid model for $\mathbb{H}^{n+1}$; see [HW2] for a similar argument in the spherical case. If we assume that H^M changes sign then M_*' may be chosen so that it separates the sets where $H^M > 0$ and $H^M < 0$. As in [HW1], Sacksteder's result can be used to reach a contradiction if we assume that M_*' is bounded. Once we know that M_*' is necessarily unbounded, we can proceed as in [HW1] by examining the geometry of the level sets M_t of the graph with respect to the t-coordinate, which are shown to be compact as one approaches infinity. For t close enough to its limiting value, which is finite due to the unboundedness of M_*', a geometric inequality essentially following from (4.56) implies that the mean curvature of M_t (viewed as a hypersurface of the hyperplane at level t and computed with respect to the *inward* unit normal) is non-positive everywhere. This obviously contradicts the compactness of M_t so that H^M czannot change sign. Thus, by Proposition 4.1, M is elliptic indeed and the uniqueness result in Theorem 1.2 follows from a standard application of the Maximum Principle. We emphasize that in [HW1] an extra condition, constraining the oscillation of the graph at infinity, is imposed in dimension $n = 3$ and 4 due to the fact that, as the Schwarzschild examples show, asymptotic flatness is compatible with the graph being *unbounded* as one approaches infinity. However, as it is apparent from (4.54), the adSS solutions are always *uniformly bounded* in a neighbourhood of infinity regardless of the dimension, so that this somewhat more involved case does not occur in our analysis.

Remark 4.1. The Huang-Wu's argument sketched above can also be adapted to establish the corresponding rigidity result for the Penrose inequality proved in [dLG2] for asymptotically hyperbolic graphs in $\mathbb{H}^{n+1}$ with a constant mean curvature horizon.

Remark 4.2. Once ellipticity of solutions of (4.55) has been established (as in Proposition 4.1), we can also argue as in [dLG3] in order to reach uniqueness. The idea is to establish first a global rigidity result for two-ended, elliptic and embedded solutions of (4.55) with asymptotically hyperbolic ends, similarly to what has been done in [HL] for scalar flat hypersurfaces, by showing that any such solution is congruent to the *double* adSS solution, which is obtained from (4.54) by reflection across the hyperplane $t = 0$. The uniqueness in Theorem 1.2 then follows by applying this result to the complete hypersurface obtained by reflecting the graph across the totally geodesic hypersurface containing the horizon. As explained in [dLG3], ellipticity implies that the reflected hypersurface is everywhere smooth and the result follows. Needless to say, the global rigidity result mentioned above certainly has an independent interest in itself and we hope to address this issue elsewhere.

Remark 4.3. With only minor modifications in the proof, Theorem 1.2 admits an obvious counterpart for space-like, asymptotically hyperbolic graphs carrying a minimal horizon inside the anti-de Sitter space $(\mathbb{K}^{n+1}, \tilde{g})$, where $\mathbb{K}^{n+1} = \mathbb{H}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ and

$$\tilde{g} = -\rho^2 dt^2 + g_0;$$

compare with (1.12).

APPENDIX A. THE ASYMPTOTIC BEHAVIOR OF MONOTONE QUANTITIES

In this appendix we present a proof of the following proposition, which provides the expected limiting values for certain monotone quantities under the inverse mean curvature flow. This precise asymptotics is used in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proposition A.1. *If Σ_t is a solution of (2.41) with Σ_0 strictly mean convex and star-shaped then*

$$\lim_{t \to +\infty} \frac{\mathcal{J}}{\mathcal{A}^{\frac{n}{n-1}}}(\Sigma_t) = \omega_{n-1}, \tag{A.57}$$

and

$$\lim_{t \to +\infty} \mathcal{L}(\Sigma_t) \geq (n-1)\omega_{n-1}. \tag{A.58}$$

As already remarked, this follows from the results in [G2] and our proof actually relies on some estimates there; see also [BHW], where a related analysis is performed for the inverse mean curvature flow in the anti-de Sitter-Schwarzschild space.

We only prove (A.58) here, since (A.57) follows by a similar, and much easier, argument. Thus, our intention is to estimate from below the function

$$\mathcal{L}(\Sigma_t) = \frac{\int_{\Sigma_t} \rho H d\Sigma_t - (n-1)\omega_{n-1} \left(\mathcal{A}(\Sigma_t)\right)^{\frac{n}{n-1}}}{\mathcal{A}(\Sigma_t)^{\frac{n-2}{n-1}}},$$

where Σ_t is a solution and $\mathcal{A} = A/\omega_{n-1}$. Let us write the hypersurfaces as graphs of a function $u = u(t, \theta)$, $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Recall that $\rho(u) = \cosh u$ so that $\dot\rho(u) = \sinh u$ and $\rho^2 - \dot\rho^2 = 1$.

From [G2] we know that, as $t \to +\infty$,

$$u = \frac{t}{n-1} + O(1) \tag{A.59}$$

and

$$|\nabla_h v| + |\nabla_h^2 v| = O(e^{-\frac{t}{n-1}}), \tag{A.60}$$

where $v = \varphi(u)$ satisfies $\dot\varphi = 1/\dot\rho$. In terms of v, the first and second fundamental forms are given by

$$g_{ij} = \dot\rho^2 \left(h_{ij} + v_i v_i\right)$$

and

$$b_{ij} = \frac{\dot\rho}{w}\left(\rho(h_{ij} + v_i v_j) - (\nabla_h^2 v)_{ij}\right),$$

where

$$w = \sqrt{1 + |\nabla_h v|^2}.$$

Notice also that

$$g^{ij} = \dot\rho^{-2}\left(h^{ij} - \frac{v^i v^j}{w^2}\right),$$

where $v^i = h^{ij} v_j$, so that the shape operator is

$$a^i_j = g^{ik} b_{kj} = \frac{\rho}{w\dot\rho}\delta^i_j - \frac{1}{w\dot\rho}\tilde h^{ik} (\nabla_h v)_{kj},$$

where

$$\tilde h^{ij} = h^{ij} - \frac{v^i v^j}{w^2},$$

and from this we see that

$$\rho H = (n-1) w^{-1}\frac{\rho^2}{\dot\rho} - w^{-1}\frac{\rho}{\dot\rho}\Delta_h v + O(e^{-\frac{3t}{n-1}}). \tag{A.61}$$

On the other hand,

$$\sqrt{\det g} = \left(\dot\rho^{n-1} + O(e^{\frac{(n-3)t}{(n-1)}})\right)\sqrt{\det h}, \tag{A.62}$$

so if we use (A.61),

$$\rho = \dot\rho + O(e^{-\frac{t}{n-1}})$$

and

$$w^{-1} = 1 - \frac{1}{2}|\nabla_h v|^2 + O(e^{-\frac{4t}{n-1}}),$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\Sigma_t}\rho H d\Sigma_t &= (n-1)\int\rho^2\dot\rho^{n-2}-\frac{n-1}{2}\int\rho^2\dot\rho^{n-2}|\nabla_h v|^2 - \\ &\quad -\int\dot\rho^{n-1}\Delta_h v+O(e^{\frac{(n-3)t}{(n-1)}}) \\ &= (n-1)\int\rho^2\dot\rho^{n-2}-\frac{n-1}{2}\int\rho^2\dot\rho^{n-2}|\nabla_h v|^2 + \\ &\quad +(n-1)\int\dot\rho^{n-2}\langle\nabla_h\dot\rho,\nabla_h v\rangle_h+O(e^{\frac{(n-3)t}{(n-1)}}),\end{aligned}$$

where integration on the right-hand side is over $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. But

$$|\nabla_h\dot\rho-\dot\rho^2\nabla_h v| = |\rho\dot\rho-\dot\rho^2||\nabla_h v| = O(e^{-\frac{t}{n-1}}),$$

so we get

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\Sigma_t}\rho H d\Sigma_t &= (n-1)\int\rho^2\dot\rho^{n-2}-\frac{n-1}{2}\int\rho^2\dot\rho^{n-2}|\nabla_h v|^2 + \\ &\quad +(n-1)\int\dot\rho^{n}|\nabla_h v|^2+O(e^{\frac{(n-3)t}{(n-1)}}) \\ &= (n-1)\int\rho^2\dot\rho^{n-2}+\frac{n-1}{2}\int\rho^2\dot\rho^{n-2}|\nabla_h v|^2+O(e^{\frac{(n-3)t}{(n-1)}}) \\ &\geq (n-1)\int\rho^2\dot\rho^{n-2}+O(e^{\frac{(n-3)t}{(n-1)}}).\end{aligned}$$

Now, from (A.62) we also have

$$\mathcal{A}(\Sigma_t)=\fint\dot\rho^{n-1}+O(e^{\frac{(n-3)t}{n-1}}),$$

where

$$\fint\dot\rho^{n-1}=\frac{1}{\omega_{n-1}}\int\dot\rho^{n-1},$$

so if we use (A.59) and the mean value theorem for integrals we end up with

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{t\to+\infty}\mathcal{L}(\Sigma_t) &\geq (n-1)\omega_{n-1}\lim_{t\to+\infty}\frac{\fint\rho^2\dot\rho^{n-2}-\fint\dot\rho^{n}+o(e^{\frac{(n-2)t}{n-1}})}{\fint\dot\rho^{n-2}+o(e^{\frac{(n-2)t}{n-1}})} \\ &= (n-1)\omega_{n-1}\lim_{t\to+\infty}\frac{\fint\dot\rho^{n-2}+o(e^{\frac{(n-2)t}{n-1}})}{\fint\dot\rho^{n-2}+o(e^{\frac{(n-2)t}{n-1}})} \\ &= (n-1)\omega_{n-1},\end{aligned}$$

as desired.

REFERENCES

[ACG] L. Andersson, M. Cai, G. J. Galloway, Rigidity and positivity of mass for asymptotically hyperbolic manifolds, *Ann. Henri Poincaré* 9 (2008), no. 1, 1-33.

[AdLM] L. J. Alías, J. H. S. de Lira, J. M. Malacarne, Constant higher-order mean curvature hypersurfaces in Riemannian spaces. *J. Inst. Math. Jussieu* 5 (2006), 4, 527-562.

[BC] H. L. Bray, P. T. Chruściel, The Penrose inequality, *The Einstein equations and the large scale behavior of gravitational fields*, 39-70, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2004.

[B] S. Brendle, Hypersurfaces of constant mean curvature in deSitter-Schwarzschild space, *arXiv:1105.4273*.

[BHW] S. Brendle, P.-K. Hung, M.-T. Wang, A Minkowski-type inequality for hypersurfaces in the Anti-deSitter-Schwarzschild manifold, *arXiv:1209.0669*.

[CH] P. T. Chruściel, M. Herzlich, The mass of asymptotically hyperbolic Riemannian manifolds, *Pacific J. Math.* 212 (2003), 2, 231-26

[CN] P. T. Chruściel, G. Nagy, The mass of spacelike hypersurfaces in asymptotically anti-de Sitter space-times, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* 5 (2001), 4, 697-754.

[DGS] M. Dahl, R. Gicquaud, A. Sakovich, Penrose type inequalities for asymptotically hyperbolic graphs, *arXiv:1201.3321*.

[dLG1] L. L. de Lima, F. Girão, The ADM mass of asymptotically flat hypersurfaces, *arXiv:1108.5474*.

[dLG2] L. L. de Lima, F. Girão, Positive mass and Penrose type inequalities for asymptotically hyperbolic hypersurfaces, *arXiv:1201.4991*.

[dLG3] L. L. de Lima, F. Girão, A rigidity result for the graph case of the Penrose inequality, *arXiv:1205.1132*.

[D] Q. Ding, The inverse mean curvature flow in rotationally symmetric spaces, *Chin. Ann. Math. Ser. B*, 32 (2011), no. 1, 27-44.

[GS] E. Gallego, G. Solanes, Integral geometry and geometric inequalities in hyperbolic space, *Differential Geom. Appl.* 22 (2005), no. 3, 315-325.

[G1] C. Gerhardt, Flow of nonconvex hypersurfaces into spheres, *J. Differential Geom.* 32 (1990), no. 1, 299-314.

[G2] C. Gerhardt, Inverse curvature flows in hyperbolic space, *J. Differential Geom.* 89 (2011), no. 3, 487-527.

[GL] P. Guan, J. Li, The quermassintegral inequalities for k-convex starshaped domains, *Adv. Math.* 221 (2009), no. 5, 1725-1732.

[HLP] G. H. Hardy, J. E. Littlewood, G. Pólya, *Inequalities*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1934.

[He] M. Herzlich, Mass formulae for asymptotically hyperbolic manifolds, *AdS/CFT correspondence: Einstein metrics and their conformal boundaries*, 103-121, Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2005.

[HL] J. Hounie, M. L. Leite, Two-ended hypersurfaces with zero scalar curvature, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 48 (1999), no. 3, 867-882.

[HW1] L.-H. Huang, D. Wu, The equality case of the Penrose inequality for asymptotically flat graphs, *arXiv:1205.2061*.

[HW2] L.-H. Huang, D. Wu, Geometric inequalities and rigidity theorems on equatorial spheres, *arXiv:1104.0406*.

[HI] G. Huisken, T. Ilmanen, The inverse mean curvature flow and the Riemannian Penrose inequality, *J. Differential Geom.* 59 (2001), no. 3, 353-437.

[L] M.-K. G. Lam, The Graphs Cases of the Riemannian Positive Mass and Penrose Inequalities in All Dimensions, *arXiv:1010.4256*.

[Ma] M. Mars, Present status of the Penrose inequality, *Classical Quantum Gravity* 26 (2009), no. 19, 193001.

[M] B. Michel, Geometric invariance of mass-like asymptotic invariants, *J. Math. Phys.* 52 (2011), no. 5.

[N] A. Neves, Insuficcient convergence of inverse mean curvature flow on asymptotically hyperbolic manifolds, *J. Differential Geom.* 84 (2010), no. 1, 191-229.

[R] H. Rosenberg, Hypersurfaces of constant curvature in space forms, *Bull. Sci. Math.* 117 (1993), no. 2, 211-239.

[Sa] R. Sacksteder, On hypersurfaces with no negative sectional curvatures, *Amer. J. Math.* 82 1960 609-630.

[S] R. Schneider, *Convex bodies: the Brunn-Minkowski theory.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.

[U] J. I. E. Urbas, On the expansion of starshaped hypersurfaces by symmetric functions of their principal curvatures, *Math. Z.* 205 (1990), no. 3, 355-372.

[W] X. Wang, The mass of asymptotically hyperbolic manifolds, *J. Differential Geom.* 57 (2001), no. 2, 273-299.

[Z] X.-P. Zhu, *Lectures on mean curvature flows*, International Press, Somerville, MA, 2002.

FEDERAL UNIVERSITY OF CEARÁ, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CAMPUS DO PICI, AV. HUMBERTO MONTE, S/N, BLOCO 914, 60455-760, FORTALEZA/CE, BRAZIL.
E-mail address: `levi@mat.ufc.br`
E-mail address: `fred@mat.ufc.br`